REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 13-21 and 23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every limitation of the claim. Smith et al. do not teach all limitations of claim 1. As to claim 1, citing Smith et al, the Examiner has stated that

> "...the high frequency communications system being operative to temporarily stop downstream transmission of the incoming voice call based on the notification so as to allow processing of the DTMF information transmitted via the network, which reads on "at least some of the **change in the ringing condition to occur**', such that interference on the downstream transmission of high frequency data due to the change in the ringing condition is mitigated, as disclosed at paragraph [0053]." (Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully point to the Examiner that the claim language, which even the Examiner has quoted, allows the change in the ringing condition to occur. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, a careful reading of the cited section reveal that Smith et al. actually blocks the ringing signal by opening the switching device 221 "to prevent the telephone call from being transferred to the bus 185." [0053].

Applicants would like to point to the Examiner that in figures 3 – 7, Smith et al. further describe the function of the circuit. According to Smith et al., the first power ring is blocked (*see* block 92 in figure 4A) to identify the calling party so that the call can be answered according to the calling party identification. In contrast, claim 1 recites that the high frequency communications system being operative to temporarily stop downstream transmission of the at least one of voice and data based on the notification so as to allow at least some of the change in

the ringing condition to occur. Therefore, Smith et al. do not teach each and every limitation of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Smith et al.

Claims 2, 4, and 6-7 depend from claim 1 and are patentably distinguishable from Smith et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 8 depends from claim 1 and is patentably distinguishable from Smith et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Further regarding claim 8, in the cited sections, Smith et al. do not even describe a buffer for storing the high-frequency data as recited in claim 8. In fact, to the contrary, the microprocessor 219 receives and processes the DTMF information to determine the calling party so that the CPU board 186 can determine the appropriate PNI communication board 217 for the incoming call. Therefore, Smith et al. do not teach the limitation as recited in claim 8 and claim 8 is further patentably distinguishable from Smith et al.

Claim 13 depends from claim 1 and is patentably distinguishable from Smith et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 16-21 and 23-30 are interpreted in the manner of claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8 and 13-15. Accordingly, claims 16-21 and 23-30 are patentably distinguishable from Smith et al. for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8 and 13-15.

Applicant believes this application and the claims herein to be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have further inquiry concerning these matters, please contact the below named attorney for Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

Abdul Zindani
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,091

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5137